arXiv:1202.2241v1 [math.MG] 10 Feb 2012

A CHARACTERIZATION OF SOME MIXED VOLUMES VIA THE BRUNN–MINKOWSKI INEQUALITY

ANDREA COLESANTI, DANIEL HUG, AND EUGENIA SAORÍN GÓMEZ

ABSTRACT. We consider a functional $\mathcal{F}$ on the space of convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the form

$$\mathcal{F}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u)\, \mathrm{S}_{n-1}(K, du)\,,$$

where $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, K is a convex body in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, and $\mathrm{S}_{n-1}(K, \cdot)$ is the area measure of K. We prove that if $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies an inequality of Brunn–Minkowski type, then f is the support function of a convex body, i.e., $\mathcal{F}$ is a mixed volume. As a consequence, we obtain a characterization of translation invariant, continuous valuations which are homogeneous of degree $n-1$ and satisfy a Brunn–Minkowski type inequality.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider functionals $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ on the space $\mathcal{K}^n$ of convex bodies in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, of the following type:

$$\mathcal{F}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u)\, \mathrm{S}_{n-1}(K, du)\,, \tag{1}$$

where $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is a (given) continuous function on the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, K is a *convex body* (a non-empty, compact, convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$) and $\mathrm{S}_{n-1}(K, \cdot)$ is the *area measure* of K (we refer to the next section for definitions). Basic properties of area measures imply that such a functional is always translation invariant, continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric and homogeneous of degree $n-1$ with respect to dilatations. The latter means that

$$\mathcal{F}(s\,K) = s^{n-1}\mathcal{F}(K)\,, \qquad K \in \mathcal{K}^n\,,\ s \geq 0\,.$$

Moreover, a functional $\mathcal{F}$ defined via (1) is a *valuation*. The valuation property requires that

$$\mathcal{F}(K_0 \cup K_1) + \mathcal{F}(K_0 \cap K_1) = \mathcal{F}(K_0) + \mathcal{F}(K_1)$$

holds for all $K_0\,,\ K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that $K_0 \cup K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$.

Conversely, a result of McMullen ([8]) states that every continuous, translation invariant valuation, homogeneous of degree $n-1$, is of the form (1). If f is the support function of some fixed convex body L, then $\mathcal{F}$ is a *mixed volume*. More precisely, according to common notation in the theory of convex bodies, we have

$$\mathcal{F}(K) = nV(K, K, \ldots, K, L) = nV(K[n-1], L)\,, \qquad K \in \mathcal{K}^n;$$

Date: February 13, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 52A20, 52A39; secondary: 52A40, 26D10.

Key words and phrases. Convex body, Brunn–Minkowski theory, Minkowski inequality, valuation, mixed volume, area measure, variational calculus.

for the definition of mixed volumes we refer to [10, Chapter 5]. In this case, $\mathcal{F}$ is non-negative and satisfies the following inequality of Brunn–Minkowski type (see [10, Theorem 6.4.3]):

$$\mathcal{F}\left((1-t)K_0+tK_1\right)^{1/(n-1)} \geq (1-t)\mathcal{F}(K_0)^{1/(n-1)}+t\mathcal{F}(K_1)^{1/(n-1)}\,, \tag{2}$$

for all $K_0\,,\,K_1\in\mathcal{K}^n$ and $t\in[0,1]$ (where the set addition is the usual Minkowski addition). Note that the exponent appearing in this inequality is the reciprocal of the order of homogeneity of $\mathcal{F}$. Inequality (2) is a consequence of the Aleksandrov–Fenchel inequalities, which are among the deepest results in Convex Geometry. It belongs to the same family of inequalities as the classical Brunn–Minkowski inequality, which states that the volume raised to the power $1/n$ is a concave functional on $\mathcal{K}^n$. For further information on this topic, we refer the reader to the survey paper [6], which is entirely devoted to the Brunn–Minkowski inequality and its connections to various other branches of mathematics.

More generally, we say that a functional $\mathcal{G}\,:\,\mathcal{K}^n\to\mathbb{R}_+$, which is positively homogeneous of degree α (for simplicity, assume $\alpha\neq 0$), satisfies an inequality of Brunn–Minkowski type, if $\mathcal{G}^{1/\alpha}$ is concave on $\mathcal{K}^n$, that is

$$\mathcal{G}\left((1-t)K_0+tK_1\right)^{1/\alpha} \geq (1-t)\mathcal{G}(K_0)^{1/\alpha}+t\mathcal{G}(K_1)^{1/\alpha}\,,$$

for all $K_0\,,\,K_1\in\mathcal{K}^n$ and $t\in[0,1]$. Examples of functionals sharing these properties arise in quite different contexts: they include a large number of geometric functionals, as well as important examples coming from different areas, like the Calculus of Variations (see, for instance, [2]). Understanding whether there are general conditions such that a given functional satisfies a Brunn–Minkowski type inequality is a fascinating problem, but maybe too ambitious. On the other hand, as a first step in this direction, one could try to answer the question in some restricted class of functionals, which is what we do in this paper by focusing on functionals of the form (1).

Note that (2) becomes an equality in dimension $n=2$, and in fact this is true for any choice of the function $f\in C(\mathbb{S}^1)$ (irrespective of whether it is a support function or not). Indeed, due to the relation

$$\mathrm{S}_1(K_1+K_2,\cdot)=\mathrm{S}_1(K_1,\cdot)+\mathrm{S}_1(K_2,\cdot)\,,\qquad K_1,K_2\in\mathcal{K}^2\,,$$

in the Euclidean plane condition (2) is satisfied with equality for every $f\in C(\mathbb{S}^1)$. Hence the problem of characterizing f via inequality (2) is reasonable for $n\geq 3$ only. In addition to (2), we also consider the weaker condition

$$\mathcal{F}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)\geq\min\{\mathcal{F}(K_0),\mathcal{F}(K_1)\}\,, \tag{3}$$

for all $K_0,K_1\in\mathcal{K}^n$ and $t\in[0,1]$. Condition (3) has the advantage of not requiring any *a priori* assumption on the sign of $\mathcal{F}$. Obviously, if $\mathcal{F}\geq 0$ on $\mathcal{K}^n$ is such that (2) holds, then $\mathcal{F}$ also satisfies (3).

The paper is devoted to proving that, *for $n\geq 3$, (3) characterizes mixed volumes among functionals of type* (1).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n\geq 3$ and $f\in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Assume that the functional $\mathcal{F}$ defined as in (1) satisfies (3). Then f is the support function of a convex body.*

According to the result of McMullen mentioned before, Theorem 1.1 can be rewritten in terms of valuations as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $\mathcal{V}$ *be a continuous, translation invariant valuation on* $\mathcal{K}^n$*,* $n \geq 3$*, which is homogeneous of degree* $n-1$ *and satisfies inequality (3). Then there exists a convex body* $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{V}(K) = V(K[n-1], L)$$

for all $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$*.*

The proof of Theorem 1.1 proceeds by induction over the dimension. In the inductive procedure, the most difficult part is the initial step, i.e. the proof in the three-dimensional case, while the reduction to lower dimensions, carried out in Section 4, is much easier.

The proof of the three-dimensional case is presented in Section 3. Roughly speaking, we compute the second variation of the functional $\mathcal{F}$, as a quadratic form on test functions. The Brunn–Minkowski inequality (3) implies that this is a negative semi-definite functional on a certain class of test functions. By a further specialization in the choice of the test functions, we obtain that the Hessian matrix of the homogeneous extension of order one of f is positive semi-definite, i.e. f is a support function. This argument was initially inspired by some ideas contained in [3] and [4], where the sign of the second variation of functionals satisfying inequalities of Brunn–Minkowski type was used to derive functional inequalities of Poincaré type.

Even though the idea upon which the proof is based is not too involved, to adapt it to the general situation in which f is just continuous, required several technical steps (contained in Section 3.3). For this reason, we outline in Section 3.2 the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the three-dimensional case under the additional assumption that f is sufficiently smooth, symmetric and positive. This should help the reader to identify the essence of the general argument.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We work in the n-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, endowed with the usual scalar product $(\cdot,\cdot)$ and norm $\|\cdot\|$. We write B^n for the unit ball and denote by $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The unit sphere is endowed with the relative topology inherited from $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, this applies to the interior or the boundary of a subset of the unit sphere.

2.1. **Convex bodies.**

Our general reference for the theory of convex bodies is the book [10] by Schneider, to which we refer for all properties of convex bodies mentioned in this section without proof.

We denote by $\mathcal{K}^n$ the family of non-empty, compact, convex subsets (i.e. convex bodies) of $\mathbb{R}^n$. If K and L are convex bodies, the Minkowski sum (or vector sum) of K and L is

$$K + L = \{a + b \,|\, a \in K\,,\, b \in L\},$$

which is again a convex body. The same holds for the dilatation of a convex body K by a non-negative real $s \geq 0$, that is

$$s\,K = \{s\,a \,|\, a \in K\}\,.$$

The *support function* h_K of a convex body K is denoted by $h_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ and given by

$$h_K(u) = \sup_{x \in K}(x, u), \quad u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}\,.$$

We will sometimes write h instead of h_K, if K is clear from the context. If h is the support function of a convex body, then the 1-homogeneous extension of h to $\mathbb{R}^n$ is convex. Vice versa, if $H : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a 1-homogeneous convex function, then its restriction to $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is the support function of a convex body. For all $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $s, r \geq 0$, we have

$$h_{sK+rL} = sh_K + rh_L\,.$$

As usual, $\mathcal{H}^j$ denotes the j-dimensional Hausdorff measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (normalized as in [5]; in particular, $\mathcal{H}^n$ equals n-dimensional Lebesgue measure). For $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, let ∂K denote the topological boundary of K. For $x \in \partial K$, we write $\mathrm{Nor}(K,x)$ for the normal cone of K at x. This non-empty, convex cone consists of all outer normal vectors to supporting half-spaces of K passing through x. Then we put $\mathrm{nor}(K,x) := \mathrm{Nor}(K,x) \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. For $\omega \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, let

$$\tau(K,\omega) := \{x \in \partial K : \mathrm{nor}(K,x) \cap \omega \neq \varnothing\}$$

be the set of all points $x \in \partial K$ such that there exists an outer unit normal vector to K at x contained in ω. If K has non-empty interior and ω is a Borel subset of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, then $\tau(K,\omega)$ is $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-measurable (see [10, §2.2]). In this case, the (surface) area measure of K can be defined by

$$\mathrm{S}_{n-1}(K,\omega) := \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\tau(K,\omega))$$

for every Borel set $\omega \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the Riemannian metric of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ induced from $\mathbb{R}^n$, and let ∇ denote the Levi-Civita connection. In the following, we consider local orthonormal frames of vector fields on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, generically denoted by $\{E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}\}$. For a function $f \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, we then write f_i and f_{ij}, respectively, for the first and second covariant derivatives of f with respect to $\{E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}\}$, where $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. As usual, δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol, hence $\delta_{ij} = \langle E_i, E_j \rangle$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Observe that $f_i = \nabla_{E_i} f = E_i(f)$. To provide an invariant definition for some of the relevant notions to be considered subsequently, we recall that the gradient ∇f of f is the uniquely determined vector field on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\langle \nabla f, X \rangle = X(f)$, for all vector fields X on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. The Hessian form $\nabla^2 f$ is then defined as the field of bilinear forms on the tangent spaces $T_u\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, of the unit sphere, which is determined by $\nabla^2 f(X,Y) = \langle \nabla_X(\nabla f), Y \rangle$, for all vector fields X, Y on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. For $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the Hessian $\nabla^2 f_u$ is a symmetric bilinear form on $T_u\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $\nabla^2 f(E_i, E_j) = f_{ij}$. Using the Riemannian metric, we can identify $\nabla^2 f$ with a field of symmetric linear maps of the tangent spaces of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

For $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$, we put

$$q_{ij}(\phi, u) := \phi_{ij}(u) + \delta_{ij}\phi(u)\,,$$

where the covariant derivatives are computed with respect to a local orthonormal frame (of vector fields), and

$$Q(\phi, u) := (q_{ij}(\phi, u))_{i,j=1}^{n-1}\,.$$

All relevant quantities and conditions will be independent of the particular choice of a local orthonormal frame in the following. For the sake of brevity, we sometimes omit the variable u and simply write $q_{ij}(\phi)$ or $Q(\phi)$.

A convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is said to be of class C^2_+, if ∂K is of class C^2 and the Gauss curvature is strictly positive at each point of ∂K. If K is of class C^2_+, then the Gauss map $\nu_K : \partial K \to \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, assigning to each point $x \in \partial K$ the outer unit normal to ∂K at x, is a diffeomorphism between ∂K and $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Moreover, the support function $h = h_K$ of K belongs to $C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, and the $(n-1)\times(n-1)$ matrix $Q(h,u)$ is positive definite for every $u\in\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Conversely, if $h\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is such that $Q(h,u)$ is positive definite (as usual, we then write $Q(h,u)>0$), then h is the support function of a (uniquely determined) convex body of class C^2_+. In the following, we consider the class of functions

$$\mathfrak{S}:=\left\{h\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}):Q(h,u)>0 \text{ for every } u\in\mathbb{S}^{n-1}\right\},$$

consisting of support functions of convex bodies of class C^2_+ (cf. [10, §2.5]).

For $K\in\mathcal{K}^n$ of class C^2_+, the area measure of K admits the representation

$$\mathrm{S}_{n-1}(K,\omega)=\int_\omega \det(Q(h,u))\,\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(du) \tag{4}$$

for every $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-measurable set $\omega\subseteq\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. This representation is still valid for a convex body K with support function $h\in C^2(\Omega)$ and any measurable set $\omega\subseteq\Omega$, where $\Omega\subseteq\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is open. This follows by an application of the coarea formula to the differentiable map $\Omega\to\tau(K,\Omega)$, $u\mapsto \operatorname{grad} h(u)$, where grad h is the Euclidean gradient of h, by observing that the Jacobian of this map is $Q(h)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-almost all boundary points of K have a unique exterior unit normal.

2.2. **The cofactor matrix and a Lemma of Cheng and Yau.**

Let $A=(a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^k$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$, be a real $k\times k$ matrix. The determinant of A can be considered as a real-valued, polynomial function of the entries a_{ij}. For $i,j=1,\dots,k$, we then define

$$c_{ij}[A]:=\frac{\partial\det}{\partial a_{ij}}(A),$$

and hence we can describe the cofactor matrix $C[A]$ of A as

$$C[A]=(c_{ij}[A]).$$

In the following, we will mainly consider symmetric matrices. The set of real, symmetric $k\times k$ matrices is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_k$. It is easy to see that if $A\in\mathcal{S}_k$, then also $C[A]\in\mathcal{S}_k$.

Remark 2.1. Consider $A\in\mathcal{S}_2$ given by

$$A=\begin{pmatrix} a & b\\ b & c\end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the cofactor matrix of A is

$$C[A]=\begin{pmatrix} c & -b\\ -b & a\end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular, for real 2×2 matrices A,B we have the useful linearity property

$$C[A+B]=C[A]+C[B].$$

In the next remark, we summarize some further properties of the cofactor matrix that will be used later on.

Remark 2.2. (i) *If A is a real $k\times k$ matrix, then*

$$\det(A)=\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i,j=1}^k c_{ij}[A]a_{ij}.$$

(ii) *Let $A \in \mathcal{S}_2$ be given. Then $C[A]$ is positive (semi-)definite if and only if A itself is positive (semi-)definite.*

A particularly useful feature of a matrix of type $C[Q(\phi)]$ is that for each row, that is for fixed $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, the sum of the covariant derivatives $(c_{ij}[Q(h)])_j$, for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, is zero. This fact was first observed and used by Cheng and Yau [1, (4.3)]. (See Lemma 1 in [4] for an extension. Relation (4.11) in [1] is also covered by Proposition 4, page 5-8, and Lemma 18, page 7-45, in [11].)

Lemma 2.1. *Let $h \in C^3(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Let $\{E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}\}$ be a local orthonormal frame of vector fields on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, in the domain of the frame we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (c_{ij}[Q(h)])_j = 0 .$$

Let $h, \psi, \phi \in C^3(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be given. We then define a vector field V on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ by

$$V = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \phi \, \psi_i \, c_{ij}[Q(h)] \, E_j ,$$

where $\{E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}\}$ is a local orthonormal frame of vector fields. Since the right-hand side is independent of the choice of the orthonormal frame (which can be easily checked by a direct calculation), the vector field is globally defined. Using Lemma 2.1, we get for the divergence of this vector field that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} V &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \phi \, \psi_i \, c_{ij}[Q(h)] \right)_j \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \phi_j \psi_i c_{ij}[Q(h)] + \phi \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \psi_{ij} c_{ij}[Q(h)]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that both summands on the right-hand side are independent of the choice of an orthonormal frame of vector fields (again this can easily be checked). The following lemma is now an immediate consequence of the divergence theorem on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, applied to the vector field V, and a subsequent approximation argument.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $h, \psi, \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Let c_{ij} denote the entries of the matrix $C[Q(h)]$. Then, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \psi \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \phi_{ij} \, c_{ij} \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} &= - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \phi_j \psi_i \, c_{ij} \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \phi \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \psi_{ij} \, c_{ij} \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} . \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.3. The preceding lemma can also be derived by working with 1-homogeneous extensions to $\mathbb{R}^n$ of functions on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, by establishing a fact analogous to Lemma 2.1 in this setting, and by applying the divergence theorem to a spherical shell.

The following consequence of Remark 2.2 (i) and Lemma 2.2 in the case $n = 3$ will be needed subsequently. Let $f, \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2 \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u) \det(Q(\phi, u))\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u) \sum_{i,j=0}^{2} c_{ij}[Q(\phi, u)] q_{ij}(\phi, u)\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u) \sum_{i,j=0}^{2} c_{ij}[Q(\phi, u)] \phi_{ij}(u)\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\phi(u)(\phi_{11}(u) + \phi_{22}(u) + 2\phi(u))\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \phi(u) \sum_{i,j=0}^{2} c_{ij}[Q(\phi, u)] f_{ij}(u)\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} 2f(u)\phi(u)^2 + f(u)\phi(u)(\phi_{11}(u) + \phi_{22}(u))\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \phi(u)^2 [f_{11}(u) + f_{22}(u) + 2f(u)]\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \phi(u) \sum_{i,j=0}^{2} c_{ij}[Q(f, u)] \phi_{ij}(u)\, \mathcal{H}^2(du).
\end{aligned}$$

By another application of Lemma 2.2, we obtain the next lemma which will play a crucial role in the sequel.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f, \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&2 \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u) \det(Q(\phi, u))\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \\
&\quad = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \phi(u)^2 \operatorname{trace}(Q(f, u))\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \sum_{i,j=0}^{2} c_{ij}[Q(f, u)] \phi_i(u) \phi_j(u)\, \mathcal{H}^2(du).
\end{aligned}$$

3. THE 3-DIMENSIONAL CASE

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.1, which is the special case $n = 3$ of Theorem 1.1. This also establishes the initial step of the induction, which will be completed in Section 4.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^2)$ and let $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{K}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by*

$$\mathcal{F}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\, \mathrm{S}_2(K, du), \quad K \in \mathcal{K}^3 .$$

Assume that

$$\mathcal{F}((1-t)K_0 + tK_1) \geq \min\{\mathcal{F}(K_0), \mathcal{F}(K_1)\}, \tag{5}$$

for all $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^3$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Then f is the support function of a convex body $L \in \mathcal{K}^3$.

3.1. **Preparatory steps.** The proof Theorem 3.1 will require some preparations. Part of this preparatory material is contained in the present subsection. In particular, we provide, for the reader's convenience, an outline of a proof for a simplified version of Theorem 3.1, under more restrictive assumptions on f. We also point out the technical problems that arise in removing the additional assumptions on f in order to cover the general case. These problems are then settled in Section 3.3, while in Section 3.4 we complete the proof of Theorem 3.1 in its full generality.

To begin with, we assume that $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies a Brunn–Minkowski inequality of the form (2), namely

$$\mathcal{F}(K) \geq 0\,, \qquad K \in \mathcal{K}^3\,, \tag{6}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}((1-t)K_0 + tK_1)^{1/2} \geq (1-t)\mathcal{F}(K_0)^{1/2} + t\mathcal{F}(K_1)^{1/2}\,, \quad K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^3\,,\, t \in [0,1]\,. \tag{7}$$

Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^3$ and let h be the support function of K. Let $\phi \in C(\mathbb{S}^2)$ and assume that for some $\epsilon > 0$ the function $h_s := h + s\phi$ is a support function, for every $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. Let K_s be the convex body having h_s as its support function. Hence the family of convex bodies $\{K_s : s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]\}$ provides a perturbation of $K = K_0$. Let $F : [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be defined by $F(s) := \mathcal{F}(K_s)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the above assumptions and notation, the function*

$$\sqrt{F} : [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \to \mathbb{R}_+\,, \qquad s \mapsto \sqrt{F(s)}\,,$$

is concave.

Proof. Let $s_1, s_2 \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$. Then we have $h_{(1-\lambda)s_1+\lambda s_2} = (1-\lambda)h_{s_1} + \lambda h_{s_2}$, so that $K_{(1-\lambda)s_1+\lambda s_2} = (1-\lambda)K_{s_1} + \lambda K_{s_2}$. The conclusion now follows immediately from (7) and the definition of F. □

The following two remarks will be used in the sequel. Note that their validity is not restricted to the three-dimensional case.

Remark 3.1. Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies (6) and (2) and does not vanish identically. Then $\mathcal{F}(L) > 0$ for all $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ of class C^2_+. Indeed, since convex bodies of class C^2_+ are dense in $\mathcal{K}^n$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous, there exists a convex body K of class C^2_+ such that $\mathcal{F}(K) > 0$. As K and L are of class C^2_+, a suitable rescaled copy of K is a *summand* of L (cf. [10, Cor. 3.2.10]), that is there exist $\lambda \in (0,1]$ and $M \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that $L = \lambda K + (1-\lambda)M$. By (6) and (2) we immediately get $\mathcal{F}(L) \geq \mathcal{F}(\lambda K) = \lambda^{n-1}\mathcal{F}(K) > 0$. In particular, we have $\mathcal{F}(B^n) > 0$.

Remark 3.2. Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be as in (1). Then

$$\mathcal{F}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h(u)\, \mathrm{S}_{n-1}(K, du)\,, \quad K \in \mathcal{K}^n\,,$$

holds for a function $h \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ if and only if $f - h$ is the restriction of a linear function to the unit sphere.

3.2. **Outline of the proof of Theorem 3.1 in a simplified case.** In this subsection we make several additional assumptions on the functional $\mathcal{F}$ (or rather, on f), and we outline the proof of Theorem 1.1 in this special case.

We assume:

(i) *regularity:* $f \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$;
(ii) *symmetry:* f is an even function, i.e. $f(u) = f(-u)$ for every $u \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
(iii) *positivity:* $f > 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^2$.

In particular, (iii) implies that $\mathcal{F}(K) > 0$ for every convex body K with non-empty interior. Clearly, we also assume that the corresponding functional $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies inequality (7).

The support function of the unit ball B^3 is the constant function $h \equiv 1$ on $\mathbb{S}^2$. For a function $\psi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$ consider the function $h_s = 1 + s\psi$. Let I denote the 2×2 identity matrix. Then, if $|s|$ is sufficiently small, the matrix $Q(h_s, u) = I + sQ(\psi, u)$ is positive definite for every $u \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Hence there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $h_s \in \mathfrak{S}$ for every $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. Let K_s be the convex body having h_s as its support function and define $F(s) = \mathcal{F}(K_s)$. According to Lemma 3.1, $\sqrt{F}$ is concave. Since $F(s) > 0$ and F is twice differentiable, we obtain that

$$2F(0)F''(0) - (F'(0))^2 \leq 0\,. \tag{8}$$

From (4) we now conclude that

$$F(s) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\,\det(Q(h_s,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\,\det(I + sQ(\psi,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,.$$

Differentiating with respect to s, at $s = 0$ we get that

$$F'(0) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\,\mathrm{trace}(Q(\psi,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,, \quad F''(0) = 2\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\,\det(Q(\psi,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,.$$

Assume that ψ is odd, that is $\psi(u) = -\psi(-u)$ for $u \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Then $\mathrm{trace}(Q(\psi,\cdot))$ is odd as well and, by (ii), it follows that $F'(0) = 0$. Hence, by (8) and since $\mathcal{F}(0) > 0$, we get $F''(0) \leq 0$, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\,\det(Q(\psi,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) \leq 0 \tag{9}$$

for every odd function $\psi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$. We now want to remove the assumption of being odd on the test function, at the price of reducing its support. Let $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ be such that its support is contained in an open hemisphere $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathbb{S}^2$, and define

$$\psi(u) = \begin{cases} \phi(u), & \text{if } u \in \mathcal{E}, \\ -\phi(-u), & \text{if } u \notin \mathcal{E}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, ψ is well defined on $\mathbb{S}^2$ and zero close to the boundary of $\mathcal{E}$. Since ψ is odd and $\det(Q(\psi,\cdot))$ is even, we deduce from (9) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f\,\det(Q(\phi))\,d\mathcal{H}^2 \leq 0 \tag{10}$$

for any $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ whose support is contained in an open hemisphere. Writing (c_{ij}) for the matrix $C[Q(f)]$, we now obtain from Lemma 2.3 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \phi^2\,\mathrm{trace}(c_{ij})\,d\mathcal{H}^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j\,d\mathcal{H}^2\,, \tag{11}$$

for any such $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$. This is a functional inequality of Poincaré type on $\mathbb{S}^2$. It is rather intuitive that such an inequality can be valid for any ϕ as described above only if the matrix (c_{ij}) is positive semi-definite throughout $\mathbb{S}^2$. This fact is demonstrated in Lemma 3.3. The idea of the proof is that if at some point $u_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$ the matrix (c_{ij}) admits an eigenvector e with negative eigenvalue, we may construct a sequence of admissible test functions ϕ_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$–norms of these functions converge to zero and their gradients tend to be parallel to e, of constant unit norm in a neighbourhood of u_0 and zero everywhere else. Choosing $\phi = \phi_k$ in (11), and letting k tend to infinity, we get a contradiction.

Once we know that (c_{ij}) is positive semi-definite, the same is true for $Q(f)$, and then f is a support function (see Corollary A.1).

In the next subsection, and in the Appendix, we prove some results which permit us to adapt the above idea when the assumptions (i), (ii), (iii) are not imposed. In particular, to remove symmetry, in the preceding perturbation argument we replace the ball by a parametric "spherical cone" C. This allows us to cancel the term $F'(0)$ in (8). Then, in order to prove (10), we need to know that $F(0) = \mathcal{F}(C) > 0$ for a suitable cone. A corresponding fact is provided in Lemma 3.4. Finally, the regularity assumption will be removed by a standard approximation procedure (described in the Appendix), which will enter at the level of (10).

3.3. **Some technical lemmas.** Let $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ and $P \in \mathbb{S}^2$. We will denote by $I_\theta(P)$ the set of points in $\mathbb{S}^2$ with spherical distance to P less than or equal to θ. More explicitly,

$$I_\theta(P) := \{Q \in \mathbb{S}^2 \,:\, (P, Q) \geq \cos\theta\}$$

is a spherical cap of $\mathbb{S}^2$ with angle of aperture θ around P. Let $C(P, \theta)$ be the convex hull of $\{0\}$ and $I_\theta(P)$. Equivalently, if D is the cone $D := \{tx \,:\, x \in I_\theta(P)\,,\, t \geq 0\}$, then $C(P, \theta)$ is the intersection of D with the unit ball centered at the origin. Clearly, $C(P, \theta)$ degenerates for $\theta = 0$ into a segment with end-points P and $\{0\}$, and it coincides with a half ball for $\theta = \pi/2$. The area measure of $C(P, \theta)$ is described in the next lemma. Recall that $\operatorname{nor}(K, x)$ is the set of exterior unit normals of the convex body K at $x \in \partial K$.

Lemma 3.2. *For $P \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{S}_2\left(C(P, \theta), \cdot\right) = \mathcal{H}^2(\cdot) \llcorner I_\theta(P) + \frac{\tan\theta}{2}\, \mathcal{H}^1(\cdot) \llcorner \Gamma_\theta(P)\,,$$

where

$$\Gamma_\theta(P) := \{x \in \mathbb{S}^2 : (x, P) = -\sin\theta\}$$

and $\mathcal{H}^2(\cdot) \llcorner I_\theta(P)$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(\cdot) \llcorner \Gamma_\theta(P)$ denote the restrictions of the measures $\mathcal{H}^2$ and $\mathcal{H}^1$ to $I_\theta(P)$ and $\Gamma_\theta(P)$, respectively.

Proof. The case $\theta = 0$ is clear, hence assume that $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$. As the area measure commutes with rotations (see [10], p. 205), we may assume that $P = (0, 0, 1)$. Hence

$$C(P, \theta) = \{(r\sin\theta'\cos\varphi, r\sin\theta'\sin\varphi, r\cos\theta') \,:\, 0 \leq r \leq 1,\, 0 \leq \theta' \leq \theta,\, 0 \leq \varphi \leq 2\pi\}\,.$$

Next we identify the two relevant portions of the boundary of $C(P, \theta)$: the spherical cap A_1 and the conical surface A_2,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \{(\sin\theta'\cos\varphi, \sin\theta'\sin\varphi, \cos\theta') \,:\, 0 \leq \theta' < \theta,\, 0 \leq \varphi \leq 2\pi\}\,, \\ A_2 &= \{r(\sin\theta\cos\varphi, \sin\theta\sin\varphi, \cos\theta) \,:\, 0 < r < 1,\, 0 \leq \varphi \leq 2\pi\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $I_\theta(P)$ is the closure of A_1. Hence $A_1 \cup A_2 \subseteq \partial C(P,\theta)$ and

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\partial C(P,\theta) \smallsetminus (A_1 \cup A_2)) = 0\,. \tag{12}$$

Note that $\partial C(P,\theta)$ is differentiable at each point of $A_1 \cup A_2$. For $Q \in A_1 \cup A_2$, let $\nu(Q)$ be the outer unit normal to $\partial C(P,\theta)$ at Q, i.e. $\operatorname{nor}(C(P,\theta),Q) = \{\nu(Q)\}$. If $Q \in A_1$, then $\nu(Q) = Q$. If $Q = r(\sin\theta\cos\varphi, \sin\theta\sin\varphi, \cos\theta) \in A_2$, then

$$\nu(Q) = (\cos\theta\cos\varphi, \cos\theta\sin\varphi, -\sin\theta)\,.$$

Hence $\nu(A_1 \cup A_2) = A_1 \cup \Gamma_\theta(P)$. By (12) and the definition of the area measure this proves that for every Borel subset ω of $\mathbb{S}^2$ we have $\mathrm{S}_2(C(P,\theta),\omega) = \mathrm{S}_2(C(P,\theta),\omega_1 \cup \omega_2)$, where $\omega_1 = \omega \cap A_1$ and $\omega_2 = \omega \cap \Gamma_\theta(P)$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{S}_2(C(P,\theta),\omega) &= \mathrm{S}_2(C(P,\theta),\omega_1 \cup \omega_2) = \mathrm{S}_2(C(P,\theta),\omega_1) + \mathrm{S}_2(C(P,\theta),\omega_2) \\
&= \mathcal{H}^2(\nu^{-1}(\omega_1)) + \mathcal{H}^2(\nu^{-1}(\omega_2)) \\
&= \mathcal{H}^2(\omega_1) + \mathcal{H}^2(\nu^{-1}(\omega_2))\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it is not hard to check that

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\nu^{-1}(\omega_2)) = \frac{\tan\theta}{2}\,\mathcal{H}^1(\omega_2)\,.$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$, $P \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $\theta \in (0,\pi/2)$. If, for every $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained in $I_\theta(P)$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u) \det\left(Q(\phi,u)\right)\, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \le 0\,, \tag{13}$$

then $Q(f,u)$ is positive semi-definite for every $u \in I_\theta(P)$.

Proof. By Remark 2.2 (ii) and due to a continuity argument, it is sufficient to show that $C[Q(f,u)]$ is positive semi-definite for every u in the interior of $I_\theta(P)$. From the assumption (13) we deduce by means of Lemma 2.3 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \phi^2 \mathrm{trace}(C[Q(f)])\, d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}[Q(f)]\phi_i\phi_j\, d\mathcal{H}^2\,. \tag{14}$$

By a standard approximation argument this inequality can be extended to every function ϕ, with support contained in $I_\theta(P)$, which is merely Lipschitz on $\mathbb{S}^2$ (correspondingly, the first derivatives of ϕ will be defined $\mathcal{H}^2$-a.e. on $\mathbb{S}^2$).

For the sake of brevity, we define $c_{ij}(u) := c_{ij}[Q(f,u)]$ for $u \in \mathbb{S}^2$. By contradiction, let us assume that there exists some $\bar{u}$ in the interior of $I_\theta(P)$ and a vector $v = (v_1, v_2) \neq 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}[Q(f,\bar{u})]v_i v_j < 0\,.$$

Without loss of generality (by a proper choice of the coordinate system), we may assume that $\bar{u} = (0,0,1) \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $v = (1,0)$. Then

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(\bar{u})v_i v_j = c_{11}(\bar{u}) < 0\,. \tag{15}$$

We identify $H := \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 = 0\}$ with $\mathbb{R}^2$ and, for $r \in (0,1)$, we set

$$D_r : = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x_i| \leq r\,,\ i = 1,2\}\,,$$
$$\tilde{D}_r : = \{u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in \mathbb{S}^2 : u_3 > 0\,,\ (u_1, u_2) \in D_r\}\,.$$

Using (15), we will construct a function ϕ which satisfies the assumptions of the present lemma, but such that inequality (14) fails to be true. In order to obtain such a function, we first define $\bar{g} : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by $\bar{g}(t) = 1 - |t|$, and denote by $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ the periodic extension of $\bar{g}$ to the whole real line. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and define $g_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon g(x/\epsilon)$. Notice that $g_\epsilon \to 0$ uniformly on $\mathbb{R}$, as $\epsilon \to 0^+$. In the following, by writing $\epsilon \to 0^+$ we mean that ϵ runs through a decreasing sequence which converges to zero. Let $G : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$G(t) := \begin{cases} 1\,, & \text{for } t \in [-1/2, 1/2]\,, \\ 0\,, & \text{for } |t| \geq 1\,, \\ 1 - 2|t|\,, & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases}$$

Hence G is bounded and Lipschitz. Let us fix $r \in (0,1)$. The function

$$\Phi_\epsilon(x_1, x_2) = g_\epsilon(x_1) G(x_1/r) G(x_2/r)\,, \quad (x_1, x_2) \in D_r\,,$$

satisfies $\operatorname{sprt}(\Phi_\epsilon) \subseteq D_r$ and is Lipschitz on D_r. We have

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial x_2}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{r} g_\epsilon(x_1) G'(x_2/r) G(x_1/r) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^2\text{-a.e. } (x_1, x_2) \in D_r\,.$$

As $G \leq 1$, $|G'| \leq 2$ and $|g_\epsilon| \leq \epsilon$ in $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial x_2} \right| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{r}\,, \quad \mathcal{H}^2\text{-a.e. in } D_r\,,$$

and then

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial x_2} = 0\,, \quad \mathcal{H}^2\text{-a.e. in } D_r. \tag{16}$$

On the other hand, for $\mathcal{H}^2$-a.e. $(x_1, x_2) \in D_r$ we have

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial x_1}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{r} g_\epsilon(x_1) G'(x_1/r) G(x_2/r) + g'_\epsilon(x_1) G(x_1/r) G(x_2/r)\,.$$

As $|g'_\epsilon| = 1$ holds $\mathcal{H}^1$-a.e. in $\mathbb{R}$, it follows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \left| \frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial x_1}(x_1, x_2) \right| = G(x_1/r) G(x_2/r) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^2\text{-a.e. } (x_1, x_2) \in D_r\,. \tag{17}$$

In particular, the above limit equals 1, $\mathcal{H}^2$-a.e. in $D_{r/2}$. Moreover, there exists a constant C independent of ϵ such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial x_1}(x_1, x_2) \right| \leq C \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^2\text{-a.e. } (x_1, x_2) \in D_r\,.$$

Next, consider the function

$$\phi_\epsilon(u) = \phi_\epsilon(u_1, u_2, u_3) := \Phi_\epsilon(u_1, u_2)\,, \quad u \in \tilde{D}_r\,,$$

and extend ϕ_ϵ to be zero in the rest of the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. As $\bar{u}$ is in the interior of $I_\theta(P)$, if r is sufficiently small, then the support of ϕ_ϵ is contained in $I_\theta(P)$. In the sequel, for $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in$

$\tilde{D}_r$ we set $u' = (u_1, u_2) \in D_r$, i.e., $u = (u', u_3)$. We may choose r small enough so that there exists a local orthonormal frame on $\tilde{D}_r$. Taking covariant derivatives with respect to this frame, by (14) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \phi_\epsilon^2 \operatorname{trace}\left(C[Q(f)]\right) d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}\left[Q(f)\right](\phi_\epsilon)_i(\phi_\epsilon)_j \, d\mathcal{H}^2 \,. \tag{18}$$

Since Φ_ϵ converges to zero uniformly as $\epsilon \to 0^+$, the same is valid for ϕ_ϵ. Hence, taking limits on both sides of (18), we get

$$0 \le \liminf_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}\,(\phi_\epsilon)_i(\phi_\epsilon)_j \, d\mathcal{H}^2 \,. \tag{19}$$

The covariant derivatives of ϕ_ϵ can be computed in terms of partial derivatives of Φ_ϵ with respect to Cartesian coordinates on D_r. In particular, for $u \in \tilde{D}_r$ there exists a 2×2 matrix $(\gamma_{ij}(u))_{i,j=1}^2$ with $\gamma_{ij} \in C^\infty(\tilde{D}_r)$, for $i, j = 1, 2$, such that

$$(\phi_\epsilon)_i(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{2} \gamma_{ik}(u) \frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial u_k}(u') \quad \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^2\text{-a.e. } u \in \tilde{D}_r \,.$$

We may assume that the local orthonormal frame has been chosen so that $(\gamma_{ij}(\bar{u}))_{i,j=1}^2$ is the identity matrix. Then, for $\mathcal{H}^2$-a.e. $u \in \tilde{D}_r$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(u)(\phi_\epsilon)_i(u)(\phi_\epsilon)_j(u) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^{2} c_{ij}(u)\gamma_{ik}(u)\gamma_{jl}(u) \frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial u_k}(u') \frac{\partial \Phi_\epsilon}{\partial u_l}(u') \,.$$

This expression is bounded, in absolute value, by the boundedness of the partial derivatives of Φ_ϵ. Moreover, by (16) and (17), for $\mathcal{H}^2$-a.e. $u \in \tilde{D}_r$ we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(u)(\phi_\epsilon)_i(u)(\phi_\epsilon)_j(u) = G^2(u_1/r)G^2(u_2/r) \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(u)\gamma_{i1}(u)\gamma_{j1}(u) \,.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(\bar{u})\gamma_{i1}(\bar{u})\gamma_{j1}(\bar{u}) = c_{11}(\bar{u}) < 0 \,.$$

Consequently, we may choose r sufficiently small so that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(u)\gamma_{i1}(u)\gamma_{j1}(u) \le c < 0 \,, \qquad u \in \tilde{D}_r \,.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+}\int_{\mathbb{S}^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(\phi_\epsilon)_i(\phi_\epsilon)_j\,d\mathcal{H}^2\\
&\qquad = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} G^2(u_1/r)G^2(u_2/r)\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(u)\gamma_{i1}(u)\gamma_{j1}(u)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\\
&\qquad = \int_{\tilde{D}_r} G^2(u_1/r)G^2(u_2/r)\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}(u)\gamma_{i1}(u)\gamma_{j1}(u)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\\
&\qquad \le c\cdot\int_{\tilde{D}_r} G^2(u_1/r)G^2(u_2/r)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) < 0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

This is in contradiction with (19). □

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is not identically zero and satisfies (6) and (7). Then, for every $P\in\mathbb{S}^2$ there exists some $\theta\in(0,\pi/2)$ so that*

$$\mathcal{F}\left(C(P,\theta)\right) > 0.$$

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Assume that there exists some $P\in\mathbb{S}^2$ such that for all $\theta\in(0,\pi/2)$, we have $\mathcal{F}\left(C(P,\theta)\right)=0$.

Let us fix θ, for the moment, and denote by K the set $C(P,\theta)$ and by h its support function. Then $h\equiv 1$ in $I_\theta(P)$. Let $\phi\in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained in the interior of $I_\theta(P)$. By Proposition A.1 there exists some $\epsilon>0$ such that $h_s = h+s\phi$ is a support function for every $s\in[-\epsilon,\epsilon]$. Let K_s denote the convex body whose support function is h_s and $F(s)=\mathcal{F}(K_s)$. Then $F(0)=\mathcal{F}(K)=0$ and (6) yields that F has a minimum at $s=0$. Thus, if the derivatives of F exist, then

$$F'(0)=0 \quad\text{and}\quad F''(0)\ge 0.$$

By Lemma 3.2, (4), the fact that the support of ϕ is contained in $I_\theta(P)$ and since area measures are locally determined we obtain:

$$F(s)=\int_{I_\theta(P)} f\det\left(Q(h_s)\right)d\mathcal{H}^2+\frac{\tan\theta}{2}\int_{\Gamma_\theta(P)} f\,d\mathcal{H}^1. \tag{20}$$

From (20) we see that F is indeed twice differentiable. Moreover, the second term is independent of s. Using the definition of the cofactor matrix, it thus follows that

$$F'(s)=\int_{I_\theta(P)} f\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}\left[Q(h_s)\right]q_{ij}(\phi)\,d\mathcal{H}^2. \tag{21}$$

Since $h=1$ in $I_\theta(P)$, the cofactor matrix of $Q(h,u)$ is the identity matrix, for every $u\in I_\theta(P)$. This implies that

$$F'(0)=\int_{I_{\theta(P)}} f\,\mathrm{trace}(Q(\phi))d\mathcal{H}^2=0\,. \tag{22}$$

Differentiating (21), we obtain for the second derivative of F at $s=0$ the expression

$$F''(0)=2\int_{I_\theta(P)} f\det\left(Q(\phi)\right)\,d\mathcal{H}^2. \tag{23}$$

Now we use the regularization argument described in the Appendix. Let $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of functions in $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$, converging uniformly to f on $\mathbb{S}^2$, which is constructed in Lemma A.1. Let $C \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ be a compact set contained in the interior of $I_\theta(P)$, and let $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$ be such that its support is contained in C. Let $g(u) = \mathrm{trace}(Q(\psi(u))$. It is clear that $\mathrm{sprt}(g) \subseteq C$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f_k(u)g(u)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2}\left(\int_{\mathbf{O}(2)} f(\rho u)\omega_k(\rho)\,\nu(d\rho)\right)g(u)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\\ &= \int_{\mathbf{O}(2)}\omega_k(\rho)\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(\rho u)g(u)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,\nu(d\rho)\\ &= \int_{\{\|\rho-\mathrm{id}\|<\delta_k\}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(\rho u)g(u)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\right)\nu(d\rho)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where id is the identity element of $\mathbf{O}(2)$ and $\delta_k = \frac{1}{k^2}$ (see the definition of ω_k in the Appendix). Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho \in \mathbf{O}(2)$ such that $\|\rho - \mathrm{id}\| < \delta_k$, and let ψ_ρ be defined by $\psi_\rho(u) = \psi(\rho^{-1}(u))$ for $u \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Then, by the rotation invariance of spherical Lebesgue measure and Lemma A.3 we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(\rho u)g(u)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\,\mathrm{trace}\left(Q(\psi_\rho, u)\right)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,.$$

For sufficiently large k (this depends on the choice of the set C, of course), the support of ψ_ρ is contained in $I_\theta(P)$, hence we may apply (22) with $\phi = \psi_\rho$ and get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\,\mathrm{trace}\left(Q(\psi_\rho, u)\right)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) = 0\,.$$

Thus, using (24), we arrive at

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f_k(u)\mathrm{trace}\left(Q(\psi, u)\right)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) = 0$$

for every $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with $\mathrm{sprt}(\psi) \subseteq C$, and for sufficiently large k. As f_k is smooth we get, using integration by parts (that is, a special case of Lemma 2.2),

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f_k(u)\,\mathrm{trace}\left(Q(\psi, u)\right)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2}\psi(u)\,\mathrm{trace}(Q(f_k, u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) = 0\,. \tag{25}$$

From (25) (and the regularity of f_k) it follows that

$$\mathrm{trace}(Q(f_k, u)) = 0\,, \tag{26}$$

for all $u \in C$ and all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Performing the same argument now with $g = \det(Q(\psi))$, and using Lemma A.3 again, (23) and $F''(0) \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f_k(u)\det\left(Q(\psi, u)\right)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) \geq 0\,,$$

for every $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$ such that $\mathrm{sprt}(\psi) \subseteq C$, and for all sufficiently large k. In particular, for any fixed $\theta' \in (0, \theta)$, we may choose $C = I_{\theta'}(P)$. For this choice of C we now apply Lemma 3.3 to $-f_k$ and conclude that $Q(-f_k, u)$ is positive semi-definite for all $u \in I_{\theta'}(P)$, if k is sufficiently large. But then (26) with f_k replaced by $-f_k$ implies that $Q(-f_k) = 0 = Q(f_k)$ in $I_{\theta'}(P)$. Now Corollary A.2 shows that f_k is the restriction of a linear function to $I_{\theta'}(P)$ if k is large enough. Letting k tend to infinity, we obtain that the same conclusion holds for f and, as θ was arbitrary, we finally conclude that f is linear on the hemisphere $I_{\pi/2}(P)$. According to Remark 3.2, we may assume that $f = 0$ in $I_{\pi/2}(P)$. Then, (20) and $F(0) = 0$ yield

$$\int_{\Gamma_\theta(P)} f \, d\mathcal{H}^1 = 0 , \quad \theta \in (0, \pi/2) .$$

A suitable decomposition of spherical Lebesgue measure now implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus I_{\pi/2}(P)} f \, d\mathcal{H}^2 = 0.$$

On the other hand, for the unit ball we have

$$\mathcal{F}(B^3) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f \, d\mathcal{H}^2 = \int_{I_{\pi/2}(P)} f \, d\mathcal{H}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus I_{\pi/2}(P)} f \, d\mathcal{H}^2 = 0 ,$$

in contradiction to Remark 3.1. □

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is not identically zero and satisfies (6) and (7). Then, for each point $P \in \mathbb{S}^2$ there is some $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$ such that, for all $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained in the interior of $I_\theta(P)$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u) \det\left(Q(\phi, u)\right) \, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \le 0.$$

Proof. Let $P \in \mathbb{S}^2$ be given. Let $\overline{P}$ be the antipodal point of P, and let $\overline{\theta} \in (0, \pi/2)$ be such that $\mathcal{F}(C(\overline{P}, \overline{\theta})) > 0$. By Lemma 3.4 the existence of $\overline{\theta}$ is ensured. Now we define $\theta := \frac{\pi}{2} - \overline{\theta}$ and $\Omega := I_\theta(P)$. Let h denote the support function of $C(\overline{P}, \overline{\theta})$. Clearly, $h \equiv 0$ in Ω. We now consider $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained in the interior of $I_\theta(P)$.

Let $\eta > 0$ and define the convex body K_η by

$$K_\eta := C(\overline{P}, \overline{\theta}) + \eta B^3 .$$

Let h_η be the support function of K_η. Then, for $u \in \Omega$,

$$h_\eta(u) = h(u) + \eta h_{B^3}(u) = \eta .$$

Moreover, the assumptions of Proposition A.1 are fulfilled by h_η and ϕ, hence there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ (which may depend on η as well) such that for every $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ the function $\hat{h}_s := h_\eta + s\phi$ is the support function of a convex body $\hat{K}_s$. Let $F : [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $F(s) = \mathcal{F}(\hat{K}_s)$.

By the construction of $\hat{K}_s$ and (4), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} F(s) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u) \, \mathrm{S}_2(\hat{K}_s, du) \\ &= \int_\Omega f(u) \, \det(\eta I + sQ(\phi, u)) \, \mathcal{H}^2(du) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \Omega} f(u) \, \mathrm{S}_2(K_\eta, du) , \end{aligned}$$

where I denotes the identity matrix in $\mathcal{S}_2$. Here we used that the support of ϕ is contained in Ω and area measures are locally determined. Note that the second integral does not depend on s. As

$$\det(\eta I + sQ(\phi, u)) = \eta^2 + s\eta \, \mathrm{trace}(Q(\phi, u)) + s^2 \det(Q(\phi, u)) ,$$

we get

$$F'(0) = \eta \int_\Omega f(u) \, \mathrm{trace}(Q(\phi, u)) \, \mathcal{H}^2(du) \tag{27}$$

and

$$F''(0) = 2\int_{\Omega} f(u)\,\det\left(Q(\phi,u)\right)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du). \tag{28}$$

Moreover, since K_η tends to $C(\overline{P},\overline{\theta})$ in the Hausdorff distance as $\eta\to 0^+$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous,

$$F(0) = \mathcal{F}(K_\eta) \to \mathcal{F}(C(\overline{P},\overline{\theta})) > 0 \quad \text{as } \eta\to 0^+. \tag{29}$$

In particular, we thus see that F is twice differentiable and $F(0) > 0$ if $\eta > 0$ is sufficiently small. By Lemma 3.1 we know that $\sqrt{F}$ is concave, and therefore

$$2F(0)F''(0) - \left(F'(0)\right)^2 \le 0\,. \tag{30}$$

Now the assertion follows by plugging (27), (28) and (29) into (30) and letting $\eta\to 0^+$. □

The proof of the following result is implicit in the argument for Lemma 3.4 and thus is based on the regularization argument contained in Lemma A.1.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $f\in C(\mathbb{S}^2)$, let $P\in\mathbb{S}^2$ and $\theta\in(0,\pi/2)$. Assume that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\det\left(Q(\phi,u)\right)\,\mathcal{H}^2(du) \le 0 \tag{31}$$

holds for all $\phi\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained in $I_\theta(P)$. Let $\theta'\in(0,\theta)$. Then there exists a sequence of functions $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$, which converges uniformly to f on $\mathbb{S}^2$, such that for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$, (31) holds with f replaced by f_k and for all $\phi\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained in $I_{\theta'}(P)$.

3.4. **Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 be fulfilled. Our aim is to prove that for each $P\in\mathbb{S}^2$ there is some $\theta\in(0,\pi/2)$ such that for all $\phi\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained $I_\theta(P)$ the inequality (31) holds. This will prove Theorem 3.1. Indeed, if this is established and $P\in\mathbb{S}^2$ is given, let θ be chosen correspondingly. By Lemma 3.5 there is a sequence of functions $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$, which converges uniformly to f on $\mathbb{S}^2$, such that for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$, (31) holds with f replaced by f_k and for all $\phi\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with support contained in $I_{\theta'}(P)$, where (say) $\theta' := \theta/2$. But then Lemma 3.3 implies that $Q(f_k,u)$ is positive semi-definite for all $u\in I_{\theta'}(P)$ and all $k\in\mathbb{N}$.

By Corollary A.1, this shows that the 1-homogeneous extension of f_k is convex in the interior of the cone spanned by $I_{\theta'}(P)$, for every k. The same must then be true for the 1-homogeneous extension of f. In particular, we thus conclude that the 1-homogeneous extension of f is locally convex on $\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\{o\}$, by a classical result due to Tietze (cf. [10, Notes for §1.3.,(2)]). But this easily yields the convexity of the 1-homogeneous extension of f, and thus f is the support function of a convex body.

Case 1: $\mathcal{F}\ge 0$ on convex bodies of class C^2_+. We further divide the treatment of this case into two subcases. Assume first that there exists a convex body $K\in\mathcal{K}^3$ of class C^2_+ such that $\mathcal{F}(K) = 0$. Let h be the support function of K and let $\phi\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$. According to Proposition A.1 there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that the function $h_s(u) = h + s\phi(u)$ is the support function of a convex body K_s of class C^2_+, for every $s\in[-\epsilon,\epsilon]$. Let F be defined on $[-\epsilon,\epsilon]$ by $F(s) = \mathcal{F}(K_s)$. Then, in particular, F is twice differentiable and F has a minimum at $s = 0$, so that $F'(0) = 0$. Moreover, by (3), there exists a sequence $(s_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, converging to 0, such that $F(s_k) = 0$ for every $k\in\mathbb{N}$.

Indeed, if on the contrary $F(s) > 0$ for every $s \in [-\delta, \delta] \setminus \{0\}$, for some $\delta \in (0, \epsilon]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= F(0) = \mathcal{F}(K) = \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{1}{2}K_{-\delta} + \frac{1}{2}K_{-\delta}\right) \\ &\geq \min\{\mathcal{F}(K_{-\delta}), \mathcal{F}(K_{\delta})\} = \min\{F(-\delta), F(\delta)\} > 0\,, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Then (as $F'(0) = 0$)

$$F''(0) = 2\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{F(s) - F(0)}{s^2} = 2\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{F(s_k) - F(0)}{s^2} = 0\,.$$

On the other hand, by (4) we have

$$F(s) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\det(Q(h,u) + sQ(\phi,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,,$$

whence, differentiating twice, we conclude that

$$0 = F''(0) = 2\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\det(Q(\phi,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,,$$

i.e. (31) follows with equality for any $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$. (In fact, this implies that f is linear, and thus the support function of a point.)

Assume now that $\mathcal{F}(K) > 0$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^3$ of class C^2_+ . In this case we aim to prove that the Brunn–Minkowski type inequality (5) implies the stronger inequality (7). Then, according to Proposition 3.1, we have (31) in the form required. It is sufficient to prove (7) when the involved bodies are of class C^2_+; the general case follows, since convex bodies of class C^2_+ are dense in $\mathcal{K}^3$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous. Let $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^3$ be of class C^2_+ and let $t \in [0,1]$; moreover, define

$$\bar{K}_0 = \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}(K_0)^{1/2}}\,K_0\,, \quad \bar{K}_1 = \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}(K_1)^{1/2}}\,K_1\,,$$

and

$$\bar{t} = \frac{t\mathcal{F}(K_1)^{1/2}}{(1-t)\mathcal{F}(K_0)^{1/2} + t\mathcal{F}(K_1)^{1/2}}\,.$$

If we apply inequality (5) to $\bar{K}_0$, $\bar{K}_1$ and $\bar{t}$, we get inequality (7) for K_0, K_1 and t.

Case 2: there exists some $K \in \mathcal{K}^3$ of class C^2_+ such that $\mathcal{F}(K) < 0$. As above, let h be the support function of K and let $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$; there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that the function $h_s(u) = h + s\phi(u)$ is the support function of a convex body K_s for every $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. Let F be defined in $[-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ by $F(s) = \mathcal{F}(K_s)$. As $F(0) < 0$, we may assume that $F(s) < 0$ for every $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. Let $s_0, s_1 \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ and $t \in [0,1]$, and define $K_0 = K_{s_0}$ and $K_1 = K_{s_1}$; moreover, setting

$$\bar{K}_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}(K_0)}}\,K_0\,, \quad \bar{K}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}(K_1)}}\,K_1\,,$$

and

$$\bar{t} = \frac{t\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}(K_1)}}{(1-t)\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}(K_0)} + t\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}(K_1)}}\,,$$

we get, from (5), that

$$\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}((1-t)K_0 + tK_1)} \leq (1-t)\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}(K_0)} + t\sqrt{-\mathcal{F}(K_1)}\,.$$

Hence, $\sqrt{-F}$ is convex and therefore also $-F$ is convex in $[-\epsilon,\epsilon]$, so that $F''(0)\le 0$. On the other hand, as above we have

$$F''(0)=2\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(u)\det(Q(\phi,u))\,\mathcal{H}^2(du)\,,$$

and therefore, in this remaining case, we have proved (31) for an arbitrary function $\phi\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The theorem will be proved by induction over the dimension n. The proof in the case $n=3$ has already been given in Section 3.

For the induction step, we assume that the result has already been proved in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $n\ge 3$. Let $f:\mathbb{S}^n\subset\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\to\mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that the associated functional $\mathcal{F}$ defined as in (1) satisfies (3).

Clearly, f is the support function of a convex body if for any hyperplane $H\subset\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ passing through the origin the restriction of f to H is the support function of a convex body. Let H be such a hyperplane, and let $e\in\mathbb{S}^n$ be orthogonal to H. For a convex body $K\subset H$ and $\lambda>0$, we define

$$Z(K,\lambda):=K+\{se:0\le s\le\lambda\}\,.$$

Thus $Z(K,\lambda)$ is an orthogonal cylinder with bases K and $K+\lambda e$ and of height λ. For $K_0,K_1\subset H$, $\lambda>0$ and $t\in[0,1]$, it is easy to check that

$$Z((1-t)K_0+tK_1,\lambda)=(1-t)Z(K_0,\lambda)+tZ(K_1,\lambda)\,.$$

Subsequently, we denote by δ_a the Dirac measure with unit point mass at $a\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Further, for a convex body $K\subset H$, we denote by $\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}(K,\cdot)$ the area measure of K with respect to H as ambient space. Using this notation, we now describe a suitable decomposition of the area measure of $Z(K,\lambda)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $K\subset H$ be a convex body and $\lambda>0$. Then*

$$\mathrm{S}_n(Z(K,\lambda),\cdot)=\mathcal{H}^n(K)\cdot\delta_{-e}(\cdot)+\mathcal{H}^n(K)\cdot\delta_e(\cdot)+\lambda\cdot\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}(K,\cdot\cap H)\,. \tag{32}$$

Proof. Let K° be the relative interior and $\partial_r K$ the relative boundary of K with respect to H. The disjoint union of K°, $K^\circ+\lambda e$ and the lateral surface $\partial_r K+\{se:0<s<\lambda\}=:\Sigma_L$ covers $\partial Z(K,\lambda)$ up to a set of $\mathcal{H}^2$ measure zero. For $x\in K^\circ$ we have $\mathrm{nor}(Z(K,\lambda),x)=\{-e\}$, and for $x\in K^\circ+\lambda e$ we have $\mathrm{nor}(Z(K,\lambda),x)=\{e\}$. If $x\in\Sigma_L$, then $\mathrm{nor}(Z(K,\lambda),x)=\mathrm{nor}^H(K,x')$, where x' is the orthogonal projection of x to H and $\mathrm{nor}^H(K,x')$ denotes the set of exterior unit normal vectors of K at x' with respect to H as ambient space. According to the definition of area measures, this description of the normal cones easily leads to (32). □

We now turn to the induction step. Let $\bar f:=f|_H$ and $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H:=\mathbb{S}^n\cap H$. Let $K\subset H$ be a convex body and $\lambda>0$. The preceding lemma yields that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} f(u)\,\mathrm{S}_n(Z(K,\lambda),du)=[f(e)+f(-e)]\mathcal{H}^n(K)+\lambda\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H}\bar f(u)\,\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}(K,du).$$

For arbitrary convex bodies $K_0,K_1\subset H$, $\lambda>0$ and $t\in[0,1]$ we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}((1-t)Z(K_0,\lambda)+tZ(K_1,\lambda)) &= \mathcal{F}(Z((1-t)K_0+tK_1,\lambda))\\
&= \mathcal{H}^n((1-t)K_0+tK_1)\cdot[f(e)+f(-e)]\\
&\qquad +\lambda\cdot\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H}\bar f(u)\,\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}((1-t)K_0+tK_1,du)\\
&\ge \min\{\mathcal{F}(Z(K_0,\lambda)),\mathcal{F}(Z(K_1,\lambda))\}\\
&= \min\Big\{\mathcal{H}^n(K_0)\cdot[f(e)+f(-e)]+\lambda\cdot\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H}\bar f(u)\,\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}(K_0,du),\\
&\qquad\qquad \mathcal{H}^n(K_1)\cdot[f(e)+f(-e)]+\lambda\cdot\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H}\bar f(u)\,\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}(K_1,du)\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we divide by λ and let $\lambda\to\infty$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H}\bar f(u)\,\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}((1-t)K_0+tK_1,du)\\
&\qquad \ge \min\left\{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H}\bar f(u)\,\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}(K_0,du)\,,\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H}\bar f(u)\,\mathrm{S}^H_{n-1}(K_1,du)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $K_0,K_1\subset H$ can be chosen arbitrarily, the inductive hypothesis can be applied to the functional defined on convex bodies contained in H, generated by the function $\bar f$, and this yields that $\bar f$ is convex in $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}_H$.

APPENDIX A.

A.1. **Mollification.** We recall a standard method to approximate continuous functions on the unit sphere by smooth functions.

Let $\psi:\mathbb{R}\to[0,\infty)$ be a function of class C^∞ with $\mathrm{sprt}(\psi)\subseteq[-1,1]$ and $\psi(0)>0$. Then, for $k\in\mathbb{N}$, we define $\omega_k:\mathbf{O}(n)\to[0,\infty)$ by

$$\omega_k(\rho):=c_k\cdot\psi(k^2\cdot\|\rho-\mathrm{id}\|^2)\,,$$

where $\mathbf{O}(n)$ is the group of rotations of $\mathbb{R}^n$, endowed with the Haar probability measure ν, “id” is the identity element in $\mathbf{O}(n)$ and c_k is chosen such that

$$\int_{\mathbf{O}(n)}\omega_k(\rho)\,\nu(d\rho)=1.$$

As a composition of C^∞ maps, ω_k is of class C^∞. The following lemma is standard.

Lemma A.1. *Let $f\in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Then, for $k\in\mathbb{N}$, the function $f_k:\mathbb{S}^{n-1}\to\mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$f_k(u):=\int_{\mathbf{O}(n)}f(\rho u)\,\omega_k(\rho)\,\nu(d\rho)\,,\qquad u\in\mathbb{S}^{n-1}\,,$$

is of class $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, and the sequence $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to f uniformly on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

A.2. **Covariant and Euclidean derivatives.** Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then the cone generated by the spherical set Ω is defined by $\hat{\Omega} := \{tx \, : \, x \in \Omega \, , \, t > 0\}$. For $h \in C^2(\Omega)$, the 1-homogeneous extension H of h is

$$H(x) = \|x\| \, h\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) , \quad x \in \hat{\Omega} \, ;$$

in particular, we have $H \in C^2(\hat{\Omega})$. The next lemma allows us to express, for $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the eigenvalues of $Q(h,u)$ in terms of the eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix $D^2H(u)$ of H in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix $Q(h,u)$ involves second covariant derivatives with respect to a local orthonormal frame of vector fields on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. As remarked earlier, the eigenvalues of $Q(h,u)$ are independent of the choice of such a frame. On the other hand, the Hessian matrix $D^2H(u)$ is an $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are the (Euclidean) second partial derivatives $\partial_i \partial_j H(u)$, $i,j = 1, \dots, n$, of H at u, determined with respect to a fixed orthonormal system $e_1, \dots, e_n$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Although the Hessian matrix depends on the choice of this basis, the n eigenvalues of $D^2H(u)$ are independent of such a choice. A discussion related to the following lemma is contained in [10, §2.5, Lemma 2.5.1] and [7, §3].

Lemma A.2. *Let $u_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. If $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix $Q(h,u_0)$, then the eigenvalues of the matrix $D^2H(u_0)$ are given by $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, 0$.*

Proof. We choose a coordinate system such that $u_0 = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Our first observation is that, by homogeneity, u_0 is an eigenvector of $D^2H(u_0)$, with corresponding eigenvalue 0. Hence it will be sufficient to prove that

$$\partial_i \partial_j H(u_0) = h_{ij}(u_0) + h(u_0)\delta_{ij} \, , \quad i,j = 1, \dots, n-1 \, .$$

On the left-hand side, we consider the (Euclidean) second partial derivatives with respect to an orthonormal basis $e_1, \dots, e_n$ with $e_n = u_0$, on the right-hand side, we consider the covariant derivatives with respect to a local orthonormal frame which equals $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ at u_0. We will write a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in the form $x = (x', y)$ with $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly, in this notation $\|x'\|$ denotes the norm in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Let

$$D = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \, : \, \|x'\| \leq 1\} \, ,$$

and define the function

$$\hat{h} \, : \, D \to \mathbb{R} \, , \quad \hat{h}(x') = h(x', \sqrt{1 - \|x'\|^2}) \, .$$

The second covariant derivatives of h at u_0 can be computed through the (Euclidean) second partial derivatives of $\hat{h}$ at o, that is

$$h_{ij}(u_0) = \partial_i \partial_j \hat{h}(o) \, , \quad i,j = 1, \dots, n-1 \, , \tag{33}$$

since we are using normal coordinates at u. On the other hand, by the definition of H we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(x',1) &= \sqrt{1 + \|x'\|^2} \, h\left(\frac{x'}{\sqrt{1 + \|x'\|^2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \|x'\|^2}}\right) \\ &= \sqrt{1 + \|x'\|^2} \, \hat{h}\left(\frac{x'}{\sqrt{1 + \|x'\|^2}}\right) , \quad x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \, . \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$\partial_i \partial_j H(u_0) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'_i \partial x'_j} \left(\sqrt{1 + \|x'\|^2}\, \hat{h} \left(\frac{x'}{\sqrt{1 + \|x'\|^2}} \right) \right) \Bigg|_{x'=o} .$$

The proof is completed by an explicit computation of the derivative on the right hand–side of the last equality, and by using (33). ☐

The next two results follow from Lemma A.2 and the homogeneity of H.

Corollary A.1. *In the notation of Lemma A.2, assume moreover that $\hat{\Omega}$ is convex. Then H is convex in $\hat{\Omega}$ if and only if the matrix $Q(h,u)$ is positive semi-definite for every $u \in \Omega$.*

Corollary A.2. *In the notation of Lemma A.2, assume moreover that $\hat{\Omega}$ is connected. If the matrix $Q(h,u)$ is the zero matrix for every $u \in \Omega$, then H is linear on $\hat{\Omega}$.*

The following result allows us to build a family of perturbations of a convex body having a portion of the boundary of class C^2 with positive Gauss curvature.

Proposition A.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and let h be its support function. Assume that there exists an open subset Ω of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $h \in C^2(\Omega)$ and $Q(h,u) > 0$ for every $u \in \Omega$. Let $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and assume that the support of ϕ is contained in Ω. Then there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that the function $h_s := h + s\phi$ is the support function of a convex body, for every $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. In particular, if $\Omega = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, then h_s is the support function of a convex body of class C^2_+ if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small.*

Proof. Let D be the support of ϕ, hence D is a compact subset of Ω. As $Q(h,u) > 0$ for every $u \in D$, by compactness there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $Q(h,u) \geq \gamma I_{n-1}$, where I_{n-1} is the identity matrix in $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$. Hence there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $Q(h_s,u) > 0$ for every u in D, and consequently in Ω, and for every $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$.

Let H and H_s be the 1-homogeneous extensions of h and h_s respectively. We know that H is convex and we want to prove that H_s is convex as well, for $s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \neq 0$, and let $u = \frac{x}{\|x\|}$. Assume that $u \in \Omega$ and let $\mathcal{U}$ be a neighborhood of u contained in Ω so that $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ is convex. Then $h_s \in C^2(\mathcal{U})$ and, by the previous part of the proof, $Q(h_s,u) > 0$ for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Consequently, by Corollary A.1, H_s is convex in $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ and in particular it is convex in a neighborhood of x. Assume now that $u \notin \Omega$; then there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of u contained in $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus D$. Then $h_s = h$ in $\mathcal{U}$ and consequently $H_s = H$ in $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$. This proves that H_s is convex in a neighborhood of x. Thus we have shown that H_s is locally convex in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{o\}$, and by a classical result due to Tietze, applied to the epigraph of H_s, this yields that H_s is convex in every convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{o\}$; from this, the convexity in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is easily obtained. ☐

Let $f \in C^2(A)$, where A is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\rho \in \mathbf{O}(n)$. We denote by f_ρ the function defined on $\rho(A)$ as the composition of f and ρ, that is

$$f_\rho : \rho(A) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad f_\rho(x) = f(\rho^{-1}(x)) .$$

Obviously, $f_\rho \in C^2(\rho(A))$. The chain rule and elementary linear algebra show that $D^2 f_\rho(x)$ and $D^2 f(\rho^{-1}(x))$ are described by similar (symmetric) matrices with respect to a fixed orthonormal basis, and hence they have the same real eigenvalues at $x \in \rho(A)$. Therefore, in particular, we have

$$\text{trace}(D^2 f_\rho)(x) = \text{trace}(D^2 f)(\rho^{-1}(x)), \quad x \in \rho(A),$$

and

$$\det(D^2 f_\rho(x)) = \det(D^2 f(\rho^{-1}(x))), \quad x \in \rho(A).$$

The following result provides similar relations for functions on the sphere. Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, let $\psi \in C^2(\Omega)$, and, for $\rho \in \mathbf{O}(n)$, denote by ψ_ρ the function defined on $\rho(\Omega)$ by

$$\psi_\rho : \rho(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \psi_\rho(x) = \psi(\rho^{-1}(x)).$$

Lemma A.3. *Using the preceding notation, we have*

$$\mathrm{trace}(Q(\psi_\rho, x)) = \mathrm{trace}(Q(\psi, \rho^{-1}(x))), \quad x \in \rho(\Omega); \tag{34}$$

$$\det(Q(\psi_\rho, x) = \det(Q(\psi, \rho^{-1}(x))), \quad x \in \rho(\Omega). \tag{35}$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\Omega}$ be the cone generated by Ω, and let Ψ be the 1-homogeneous extension of ψ to $\hat{\Omega}$. Clearly, $\Psi_\rho = \Psi \circ \rho^{-1}$ is equal to the 1-homogeneous extension of ψ_ρ. Let $0, r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}$ denote the common eigenvalues of $D^2\Psi_\rho(x)$ and $D^2\Psi(\rho^{-1}(x))$, where $x \in \rho(\Omega)$. By Lemma A.2, applied to Ψ_ρ as the 1-homogeneous extension of ψ_ρ at x, it follows that $Q(\psi_\rho, x)$ has the eigenvalues $r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}$. In the same way Lemma A.2, applied to Ψ as the 1-homogeneous extension of ψ at $\rho^{-1}(x)$, shows that $Q(\psi, \rho^{-1}(x))$ has the eigenvalues $r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}$. Now (34) and (35) follow immediately. □

REFERENCES

[1] S. T. CHENG, S. T. YAU, On the regularity of solutions of the n–dimensional Minkowski problem, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **29** (1976), 495–516.

[2] A. COLESANTI, Brunn–Minkowski type inequalities for variational functionals and related problems, Adv. Math. **194** (2005), 105-140.

[3] A. COLESANTI, From the Brunn–Minkowski inequality to a class of Poincaré–type inequalities, Commun. Contemp. Math. **10** (2008), 765–772.

[4] A. COLESANTI, E. SAORÍN GÓMEZ, Functional inequalities derived from Brunn–Minkowski inequalities for quermassintegrals, J. Convex Anal. **17** (2010), 35–49.

[5] H. FEDERER, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1969.

[6] R. J. GARDNER, The Brunn–Minkowski inequality, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **39** (2002), 355-405.

[7] R. HOWARD, Convex Bodies of Constant Width and Constant Brightness, Adv. Math. **204** (2006), 241–261.

[8] P. MCMULLEN, Continuous translation invariant valuations on the space of compact convex sets, Arch Math. **34**(1980), 377–384

[9] P. MCMULLEN, Monotone translation invariant valuations on convex bodies, Arch. Math. **55** (1990), 595–598.

[10] R. SCHNEIDER, *Convex Bodies: The Brunn–Minkowski Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[11] M. SPIVAK, *A Comprehensive Introduction to Differential Geometry*, Vol. 2, Publish or Perish, Houston, Tex., 1999.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA "U. DINI", VIALE MORGAGNI 67/A, 50134 FIRENZE, ITALY
E-mail address: `colesant@math.unifi.it`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KARLSRUHE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
D-76128 KARLSRUHE, GERMANY
E-mail address: `daniel.hug@kit.edu`

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, OTTO-VON-GUERICKE UNIVERSITÄT MAGDEBURG,
UNIVERSITÄTSPLATZ 2, D-39106 MAGDEBURG, GERMANY
E-mail address: `eugenia.saorin@ovgu.de`